

~~DETOS 7237~~
 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 for the STATE OF MICHIGAN
 EASTERN DISTRICT, SOUTHERN DIVISION

JEFFREY LYNN GERMAIN and MARTY BRYAN MILLER and;
 STEPHEN SAUNDERS LEITH and JOHN J. ORLANDO and;
 WILLIE F. AGEE and EFREN PAREDES, Jr. et al
 and
 HENRY HILL, et al for Case number 10-14568 this Court.

PETITIONER(s),
 vs.

CASE NUMBER: _____

WARDEN LARSON, Warden for:

Central Michigan Correctional Facility, 320 N. Hubbard St.
 RESPONDENT / St Louis MT 48820

By Agent: Amy E. Meissner - Germain

Case:2:13-cv-12904

For: N.A.I.L.S.* Inc.

Judge: Cleland, Robert H.

-7710 Abbott South, Suite #6
 Miami Beach, Florida 33141
 (305)-861-9602

MJ: Whalen, R. Steven

Email: info@nailslawfirmreferrals.com
www.NailsLawFirmReferrals.com

Filed: 07-03-2013 At 10:16 AM

OR: www.WeThePeopleTheAmericanParty.com /

HC GERMAIN ET AL V. LARSON (DA)

JOINT PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS, and;
 DEMAND FOR CLASS ACTION CERTIFICATION and CONSOLIDATION, and;
 IMMEDIATE RELIEF FOR PLAINTIFFS IN SUMMARY FORM and;
 MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF FOR CITIZENS WHO ARE BEING HELD AS
 "INMATES" IN THE VARIOUS MICHIGAN JAILS AS A RESULT OF THE
 CONTINUING PATTERN OF MISBEHAVIOR BEING PERPETRATED UPON THEM BY
 OSTENSIBLE AGENTS FOR THE GOVERNMENT ACTING IN COLLUSION AND
 UNDER COLOR OF AUTHORITY AND COLOR OF LAW

Now comes Jeffrey L. Germain and Marty B. Miller and Stephen S. Leith and John J. Orlando and Willie F. Agee and Efren Paredes, Jr. and Henry Hill, et al from case number 10-14568 incorporated herein and hereafter collectively, referred to as the instant Petitioners" and/or "Class Representatives", also presenting are the collective plaintiffs, who are represented by the afore-mentioned petitioners and are individually identified by Name and Michigan Department of Correction ("MDOC") Numerical Identifiers that have been submitted on an attached list that is titled EXHIBIT-VICTIMS", and are hereafter referred to as Class Members" who also join in submitting to this court the following

Petition for Habeas relief by and through their collective agent, Amy E. Meissner - Germain, for this honorable Court to inquire into the cause of detention of the above captioned Petitioners and the identified "Class Members" who are currently restrained of their liberty in the Carson City Correctional Facility (DRF) located at 10274 Boyer Road Carson City, Michigan 48811-5008 and other ("MDOC") and Michigan State facilities respectively.

Jurisdiction in this court is proper to review this original action, Pursuant to 28 USC § 2241 (c)(1)-(3); 28 USC § 2241 (d); 28 USC § 2242 et seq; 28 USC § 2243 et seq; 28 USC § 2244 et seq; 28 USC § 2245 et seq; 28 USC § 1343(a)(3); as well as 28 USC § 2254 (B)(i)-(ii) exclusively.

The Petitioners assert for the record to the best of their knowledge and belief, that there are no other pending actions relative to these claims in any other Courts of competent jurisdiction.

CLASS CERTIFICATION is proper and is necessary, as well as required by law and pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure ("FRCP") Rule 23, and more specifically;

FRCP 23(a)(1),(2)-(3)-(4);

FRCP 23(b)(1)(A)(3)(D);

FRCP 23(c)(A),(B),(C);

FRCP 23(c)(2)(A), (B)(i),(ii),(iii),(iv),(v),(vi),(vii);

FRCP 23(d)(1)(A),(B)(i),(ii),(iii);

FRCP 23(d)(1)(C),(D),(E).

MC

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT

The "Instant Petitioners" do hereby advance their legal argument in support of the granting of the Writ of Habeas Corpus and the Class Action Certification, by providing the following factual information and evidence to the Court as the rules of procedure prescribe and the law requires, and is hereby submitted in the following forms;

(1). Plaintiffs collectively share several irrefutable commonalities by way of evidence, that being no proper complaint or any complaint was/were ever filed, thereby proving that the inferior courts never had subject matter jurisdiction or any lawful authority and therefore all actions were/are void ab initio as absolute nullities regarding the attached captioned cases.

(2). Plaintiffs are illegally detained and unlawfully restrained of their Constitutional right to liberty, contrary to the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

The illegal and unlawful detention by the Instant Respondent/s is occurring in the ("MDOC") facility within the geographical confines of the State of Michigan and more specifically STF Correctional Facility.

Other facilities yet to be specifically identified, yet being the exact locations of other yet unidentified "Class Members", and equates to any facility in Michigan that is currently restraining individual citizens under the fictitious auspice of Constitutional Due Process, yet who are actually being similarly abused. These facilities are; e.g. City Jails, County Jails,

MC

Twpshp. holding cells, etc.

(3). Plaintiffs are being restrained as a result of the various Respondent's reliance on illegal and unlawful orders of commitment that were/are being erroneously issued by various purported, Michigan State District Court and Circuit Court Judges and routinely upheld by State Court of Appeal Judges and State Supreme Court Judges who are actually acting under color of law and color of authority, Whose decisions the various Respondents have been relying on in good faith, to continue the illegal and unlawful detention of the various plaintiffs.

(4). The purported Trial Court was without Subject Matter Jurisdiction as there was never a criminal complaint issued and/or filed upon which Plaintiff/s could have been arrested at the District Court level nor convicted at the "Trial Court" level.

Since no felony complaint included any crime/s for probable cause review by the Magistrate Judge at the District Court level so as to cause to be issued, a warrant for the arrest of plaintiffs, said warrants were never properly created nor filed.

Therefore, no valid "BIND OVER" could ever occur in order to cause the "VICTIMS" to be forwarded to any Michigan Circuit Court for any legal or lawful process, as all things occurring in this venue would be absolutely void as well.

(5). Respondent, Warden Larson, is the Warden of STF Correctional Facility, In St.Louis , Michigan, where the "Instant Petitioners" are being unlawfully detained.

(6). Respondents, yet to be identified are the Police,

MC

Sheriffs, Constables etc. etc. of the various aforementioned Michigan Jails and holding facilities, that are situated in Michigan, where the "Class Members" who have been and are being identified, are being unlawfully detained and imprisoned.

(7). The issue/s to be resolved involve legal principles of major significance to the State's jurisprudence, and questions the validity of the State District Courts and the Circuit Courts as well as the State Court of Appeals and the State Supreme Court, jurisdictional authority, where the purported charging devices failed to include the statutory mandated criterion vesting the court with any jurisdiction over the parties, even had they been filed(emphasis added).

The possible greater significance, is the overwhelming and debilitating impact that these collective abuses have caused to, not only those illegally confined but to the families, loved ones and TAXPAYERS who have been systematically coerced, cajoled and bamboozled in order for the perpetrators to finance this self serving bastardizing of the law in order for the few to prosper at the expense of the many in this thing they call "The Business of Law".

(8). Plaintiffs assert that medical care is also being denied the restrained "Class Members" and that the substantial evidence that has been gathered by Officers of the Court and Members of the Michigan Bar Association is being withheld so that these same persons can financially profit from the aforementioned abuses.

Unfortunately, the Attorneys and Law Firm, i.e. Ari Kresch and Alyson Oliver of Kresch/Oliver PLLC, located at 24100

MC

Southfield Rd. Suite 305, Southfield, Michigan 48075 Tele:(248)-327-6556 and (800)-529-3476, were informed by Instant Petitioners, Germain in numerous letters and phone calls, though they still continue to turn a blind eye to these factual assertions while continuing to solicit in the tens of thousands, supposedly to file a class action law suit for the deprivation of medical treatments.

However, these particular attorneys do not seem to feel the legal or moral or professional obligation to inform on their legal brethren, either to their purported clients or the Courts.

Therefore, since they refuse to assist their purported clients, yet plan to prosper from their illnesses and captive status, it is the respectful request of the instant Petitioners that this Court shall Order these Attorneys as individuals and to Order the PLLC as well, to surrender the tens of thousands of squired solicitations for information from these prisoners, so that known members can be matched to their questionnaires in order to consolidate claims for Judicial economy as well as, being able to discover new members.

We believe, as Class Representatives, these prisoners would rather have their freedom now rather than to wait for Kresch/Oliver PLLC to decide whether these persons are viable candidates for a very specialized class action suit.

They may never garner the "client" one iota of money or one scintilla of freedom or any timely medical attention.

Mostly, because it appears not to be their intention to allow their purported clients, transparency with regard to their

MC

possible illegal restraint. Or to perform the required due diligence to ascertain whether the purported Clients are being illegally and unlawfully restrained.

Petitioners continue to reference Kresch/Oliver PLLC clients as purported because, the Law, the Rules of Professional Conduct and their oaths require them to investigate, participate and expose when they discover the aforementioned violations of law and deprivations of Constitutional Rights.

Since they fail to perform these duties, the persons who they call "clients" may only turn out to be fraudulently acquired victims. Any information that would confirm these assertions would not be privileged work product and is necessary to expedite exposure so that the truly sick, may acquire medical treatment more expeditiously than Kresch/Oliver PLLC is willing or able to provide them.

Additionally, Kresch/Oliver PLLC and any and all Attorneys working for or with them regarding a class action for deprivation of medical treatment involving Michigan prisoners ("Class Members"), should be barred from filing such an action as it is the intention of the certified class to subpoena these persons for documents and testimony, thus they would be conflicted as legal counsel.

Should this Court refuse to compel Kresch/Oliver PLLC or affiliates to surrender the requested documents, it is the intention of this Class, by and through its members to solicit every discernible "prisoner" that Kresch/Oliver PLLC solicited from "MDOC" databases or private sources providing the same

MC

contact information.

By their own admission a possible Fifteen thousand to approximately One Hundred thousand prisoners was their target solicitation.

It is our position (Class Representatives) that Kresch/Oliver PLLC potential claims should be required to be consolidated with the instant action. Especially since various member's health and possibly their lives are at stake.

(9). Plaintiffs assert that there is no other available remedy by law to address the illegal detention, other than by way of this Habeas Corpus proceeding at this time. Any request for redress in a State Court would be vexatious and utterly futile, since the State Judge at any level is more probably than not, himself/herself a perpetrator and coconspirator and NOT a Neutral Detached Magistrate or fact-finder, as the law requires.

Relevant Facts and Background

Common to All Asserted Claims

(A). Plaintiff/s are currently detained by the various respondents who, at all times relevant, are acting on behalf of the ("MDOC") and other Michigan State facilities, albeit under color of authority. Good faith reliance on a void order of commitment still does not justify the continuing restraint by the various respondents.

(B). Plaintiffs aver that their confinement is contrary to both State and Federal Constitutions, i.e. US CONST. ARTS. IV, V, VI, XIV; and Const 1963, art 1 § 17.

(C). The law provides that it MUST first appear that an

MC

offense cognizable by the Court has been committed before it becomes the duty of the Magistrate to issue a warrant for arrest, since no valid warrants have ever been issued and/or filed anywhere as the law requires relative to the purported instant offense, it certainly stands to reason that the absence of such a warrant is either due to judicial abuse and bias or the actual recognized absence of the required elements that would allow/require the Magistrate to act, so he/she declines to act for the Prosecutor.

Issuing the Writ

(D). Plaintiffs urge this Court to grant the Writ forthwith and with out any delay and to compel Respondent to comply with this courts order for petitioners immediate release from confinement, as Petitioners and "Class Members" are imprisoned under an illegal premise in violation of their Constitutional Rights.

Summary of Arguments, and the Necessity for the Writ

Plaintiffs should prevail in this cause of action for their argument of the inferior courts lack of subject matter jurisdiction or any valid jurisdiction at all. Further the official record will demonstrate that there is/are no criminal complaint/s filed in the respective purported cases, that which begins the judicial process against the class members.

As jurisdiction always depends upon the allegations instead of the facts, the question of jurisdiction does not therefore depend on the truth or falsehood of the charge, but upon the nature ** it is determinable upon the commencement, not on the

MC

conclusion of the inquiry. This requires the filing of a felony criminal complaint containing specific requisite information that are sworn to as a matter of law and filed in a specific manner and at a specific location, also according to law. This required thing, to this date has never been done and as a result cannot lawfully be done. Therefore;

Standard of Review

As an original action in this court a de novo review is required and as such Petitioners present, adopt and hereby incorporate in toto and in support of their legal arguments, the official record of the lower court and proposed "Motion for Summary Disposition to Vacate Void Judgement for LACK OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION; and to Issue Immediate Order of Release" that is hereby attached and also contains the required bonifides and exhibits of evidence as is required to support plaintiffs assertions and factual allegations as well as book copies of Michigan Court Rules ("MCR") and Michigan Compiled Law ("MCL") and Case Law that has been disseminated by the U.S. Government, to continue to inform the citizenry of the decisions of the Superior Courts in proper context and as the law requires they be disseminated. These appendixes are collectively submitted under the title of "CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT ~~one~~"A."

CONCLUSION

The factual assertions and allegations of Constitutional violations and governmental improprieties necessitate the intervention by this Honorable Court so as to, facilitate the review of the combined evidences so that the actual redress

MC

requested may be implemented forthwith and without any delay as the law provides. Time is of the essence, as the harms complained of continue to be exacerbated by the illegal repetitive bad acts of the aforementioned ostensible agents and their various cohorts who are purportedly doing their jobs daily.

RELIEF REQUESTED

WHEREFORE, Petitioners pray, that in light of all of the foregoing arguments and evidences listed above and attached hereto, that this honorable court shall grant the "Instant Petitioners" Writ of Habeas Corpus and issue an order that is appropriate to compel the ostensible agents for the government to relinquish the improper custodial control forthwith and without any delay.

Additionally, to identify, classify and certify the requested "Class" and to notify the "Class Members" of same. Also, to commence a proper and vigilant investigation and inquiry into the legality of detention of the various "Class Members" who have been identified, who are asserting that they are being illegally and unlawfully restrained and detained. Also, to grant the injunctive relief requested herein and issue appropriate Orders in order to enjoin the purported agents for the government from continuing their collective abuses and heinous deprivations of the Civil Rights that the State Constitution and more emphatically the United States Constitution provides for its citizenry. The Federal violations in these instances would be defined in Title 18 § 241 and 242 as well as 1509 as well as Title 42 § 1985.

This Court, should cause, by appointment if necessary, the

MC

assistance of counsel for the lawful facilitation of their ("Class Members") release from confinement, where ever they should be found to be imprisoned. And to provide any other redress that is lawful and that this Court considers just.

As well, Petitioners and Members would anticipate that the Court would initiate investigations as an Officer of the Court and an agent of the People, and to facilitate or assist in the facilitation of levying criminal charges against those who would be found, in this review, to be of a criminal nature. (i.e. Judges, Prosecutors, Police Officers, Attorney Generals, and Attorneys, as well as Governors), and any others who are subsequently exposed as being additional aiding and abetting, and defined as responsible parties to the kidnap of, and the illegal and unlawful confinement of the "Instant Petitioners" and the "Class Members", notwithstanding the Frauds, Thefts, Extortion, Coercions, Misfeasances, Malfeasances, Nonfeasances, Perjury, Criminal Abuse of Public office, Filing False Official Reports, Acts of Omission, Fraud on the Court, Criminal Facilitation, Manslaughter, Second Degree Murder, Tyranny and NATIONAL TERRORISM etc. etc.

It would be prudent to keep in mind that the submitted attached list of "Class Members" is reflective of only a small portion of potential "Class Member" victims, that have suffered in at least the last 50 years, in the Courts, in the State of Michigan.

The Instant Petitioners would also respectfully request that this Court issue a continuing Order that allows the continued

amending of this instant action as the specific identities of other Members become known and their location discovered. These potential Members could and should be identified through Court records which are public and these Members should be provided a forum for redress as the law and the Constitution of the United States provides for its citizens. This should be done to minimize and obviate the affirmative bad acts that were and are being visited upon these presumptively innocent citizens.

Respectfully Submitted

By Jeffrey L. Germain
PETITIONER/REPRESENTATIVE

JEFFREY L. GERMAIN

By Stephen S. Leith
PETITIONER/REPRESENTATIVE

STEPHEN S. LEITH

On behalf of John Doe/s and Jane Doe/s and;

Filed by: Amy E. Meissner - Germain AND DOMINIC ORLANDO

Agent for;

National Alliance for Independent Lawyers Syndicated

N.A.I.L.S.® Inc.
7710 Abbott South
Suite #6
Miami Beach Florida 33141
(305)-861-9602
Email: info@nailslawfirmreferrals.com
www.nailslawfirmreferrals.com

Dated June 12, 2013

VERIFICATION

The above named Petitioner/Representatives hereby verify that the foregoing assertions and averments are true to the best of their information knowledge and belief. The above named Agent hereby attests that the foregoing Motions have been filed with the clerk of the Court for the United States District Court in the State of Michigan for the Eastern District, Southern Division on the _____ day of August 2012 by delivering to the Clerk pursuant to Court Rules.

MASTER TABLE OF CONTENTS
for
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS SENIOR PLEADING

[Item (1)] = Page/s 0001 > 0014

WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS AS A CLASS ACTION FOR HOSTAGES INTERNED IN MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION'S FACILITIES Verbatim Text

14-A-

[Item (2)] = Page 15

28 USC § 1343(a)(3) BOOK COPY

[Item (3)] = Page/s 0016 > 0018

CHAPTER 153 -HABEAS CORPUS; i e

*** 28 USC § 2241 et seq BOOK COPY

*** 28 USC § 2242 et seq BOOK COPY

*** 28 USC § 2243 et seq BOOK COPY

*** 28 USC § 2244 et seq BOOK COPY

*** 28 USC § 2245 et seq BOOK COPY

*** 28 USC § 2254(B)(i) and (B)(ii) BOOK COPY

[Item (4)] = Page/s 0019 > 0020

42 USC § 1983 (110 Stat 3853) BOOK COPY

*** 42 USC § 1986 (17 Stat 15) BOOK COPY

*** 42 USC § 1985 (17 Stat 13)(1) (2) (3) BOOK COPY

[Item (5)] = Page/s 0021 > 0024

FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE;

RULE 3 Commencing an Action Plus Notes BOOK COPY

[Item (6)] = Page/s 0025 > 0027

FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE;

RULE 23 Class Actions;

*** 23(a)(1) (2) (3) (4) BOOK COPY

*** 23(b)(3)(D) BOOK COPY

*** 23(c)(A) (B) (C) BOOK COPY

*** 23(2)(A) BOOK COPY

*** 23(B)(i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) (vi) (vii) BOOK COPY

*** 23(d)(1)(A) BOOK COPY

*** 23(d)(1)(B)(i) (ii) (iii) BOOK COPY

*** 23(d)(1)(C) BOOK COPY

*** 23(d)(1)(D) BOOK COPY

*** 23(d)(1)(E) BOOK COPY

[Item (7)] = Page/s 0028 > 0032

*** FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE;

RULE 3 The Complaint et seq Plus Notes BOOK COPY

*** FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE;

Arrest Warrant or Summons on a Complaint

RULE 4(a) and (4)(b)(1)(A) (B) (C) (D) BOOK COPY

*** FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE;

Initial Appearance

RULE 5(a)(1)(A) BOOK COPY

RULE 5(a)(3)(b) BOOK COPY

RULE 5(a)(3)(c)(1)(A) BOOK COPY

RULE 5(a)(d)(1)(A) (B) BOOK COPY

MASTER TABLE OF CONTENTS
for
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS SENIOR PLEADING continued

[Item (8)] = Page/s 0033 > 0038
Table of contents for attachments for Senior Writ of Habeas Corpus Class Action.

[Item (9)] = Page/s 0039 > 0040
Caption page for [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT - A] and Section A; Synopsis 2 Pages
[CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT - A] = actual ATTACHED EXHIBITS [1845 pages]

[Items 10 > 22 = Pages A5 > A260]

[Item (10)] = Page/s 0041 > 0047
Table of Contents for; PORTFOLIO OF INSTRUCTIONS and STATE and FEDERAL CASE CITES and CASE LAW as well as STATE and FEDERAL COURT RULES and MODEL MOTIONS to CHALLENGE "LACK OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION" plus CHECKLIST and PROLOGUE and INTRODUCTION. 7 Pages

[Item (11)] *** 10 STEPS
PROCEDURE FOR COURT TO ACQUIRE SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION. 5 Pages

[Item (12)] *** Section D =
[TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ALPHABETICAL]. 6 Pages

[Item (13)] *** Section D1 =
[CHRONOLOGICAL DATE TABLE OF AUTHORITIES]. 6 Pages

[Item (14)] *** Section D2 =
[FEDERAL CITATION TABLE OF AUTHORITIES]. 9 Pages

[Item (15)] *** Section E =
TABLE OF AUTHORITY INDEX FOR; "MICHIGAN COURT RULES"]. 4 Pages

[Item (16)] *** Section F =
TABLE OF AUTHORITY for; "MICHIGAN COMPILED LAW"] 4 Pages

[Item (17)] *** Section 14-A =
MICHIGAN COURT RULES verbatim INDEX, 17 Pages

[Item (18)] *** Section 28-A =
MICHIGAN COMPILED LAW verbatim INDEX, 18 Pages

[Item (19)] *** Section T or (44-A) =
LEGISLATIVE INTENT CHRONOLOGY, 49 Pages

[Item (20)] *** Section EXHIBIT MCR =
Table of Authorities and BOOK COPIES of Michigan Court Rules. 25 Pages

[Item (21)] *** Section EXHIBIT MCL =
Table of Authorities and BOOK COPIES of Michigan Compiled Law. 32 Pages

[Item (22)] *** Section W =
[MODEL MOTION] titled MOTION FOR SUMMARY DISPOSITION TO VACATE VOID JUDGMENT for LACK OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION and ISSUE ORDER FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE. 72 Pages

MASTER TABLE OF CONTENTS
for
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS SENIOR PLEADING - continued

[Item (23)] *** Section B; Synopsis
Page 297

[Items 24 > 42 = Pages 81 > 8207]

[Item (24)] *** Section W continued =
SECOND MODEL MOTION for JEFFREY L Germain // TABLE OF CONTENTS INDEX OF
ATTACHMENTS FOR; JEFFREY L GERMAIN Prison #163033; Case #05 005421 01 FY //
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES INDEX 75 Pages

[Item (25)] *** [Appendix - DCR] =
District Court Register of Actions for case #05 195 FY 3 Pages

[Item (26)] *** [Appendix - A] =
COMPLAINT FELONY" purportedly! 2 Pages

[Item (27)] *** [Appendix - B] =
WARRANT FELONY" purportedly! 2 Pages

[Item (28)] *** [Appendix - C] =
WAYNE COUNTY WARRANT RECOMMENDATION 2 Pages

[Item (29)] *** [Appendix - D] =
APPEARANCE BY RETAINED ATTORNEY" 2 Pages

[Item (30)] *** [Appendix - E] =
BIND OVER PACKET CERTIFICATION purportedly! 2 Pages

[Item (31)] *** [Appendix - F] =
BIND OVER certificate purportedly! 2 Pages

[Item (32)] *** [Appendix - G] =
INFORMATION FELONY" purportedly! 2 Pages

[Item (33)] *** [Appendix - GG] =
Purported CIRCUIT COURT ARR AIGNMENT TRANSCRIPT 4 Pages

[Item (34)] *** [Appendix - H] =
APPEARANCE BY RETAINED ATTORNEY" 2 Pages

[Item (35)] *** [Appendix - J] =
Purported VERDICT FORM" 2 Pages

[Item (36)] *** [Appendix - K] =
Purported ORDER OF CONVICTION AND SENTENCE 2 Pages

[Item (37)] *** [Appendix - L] =
Purported JUDGMENT OF SENTENCE AND ORDER OF COMMITMENT TO DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS 3 Pages

[Item (38)] *** [Appendix Umberger Testimony] transcript 35 Pages

MASTER TABLE OF CONTENTS
for
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS SENIOR PLEADING continued

[Item (39)] *** [Appendix CCR] =
CIRCUIT COURT REGISTER OF ACTIONS Case #05 005421 D1 FY 5 Pages

[Item (40)] *** Table of Authorities Index for Michigan Court Rules 2 Pages

[Item (41)] *** Table of Authorities Index and;
BOOK COPIES of Michigan Court Rules 26 Pages

[Item (42)] *** Table of Authorities Index and;
BOOK COPIES of Michigan Compiled Law 34 Pages

[Item 43 = Pages 8208 > 8740 plus;
EXHIBIT CASE# 115 which consists of 1 caption page and;
36 pages that are page numbered accordingly

Table of Authorities; Index for EXHIBIT CASE#
In Chronological Case order and Chronological Date order < 15 pages >
This section contains the 115 cases cited and attached in BOOK COPIES

***Turner v People ***33 MICH 363 (1876)	< 12 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 1]
***In re Sarah May ***41 MICH 299 (1879)	< 4 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 2]
***People v Haffron ***53 MICH 527 (1884)	< 3 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 3]
***People v Clement ***72 MICH 116 (1888)	< 3 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 4]
***Muskrat v U S ***219 US 346 (1910)	< 4 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 5]
***Brown v Hadwin ***182 MICH 491 (1914)	< 5 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 6]
***Goetz v Black ***256 MICH 564 (1932)	< 5 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 7]
***Strauss v Barheie ***262 MICH 113 (1933)	< 3 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 8]
***Jackson City Bank and Trust v Fredrick ***271 MICH 538 (1935)	< 6 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 9]
***People v Monick ***283 MICH 195 (1938)	< 4 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 10]
***Warner v Nobel ***285 MICH 654 (1938)	< 9 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 11]

**MASTER TABLE OF CONTENTS
for
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS SENIOR PLEADING continued**

***Fox v Martin ***267 MICH 147 (1938)	< 5 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 12]
***In re Fraser ***288 MICH 392 (1939)	< 2 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 13]
***Shane v Hackney ***341 MICH 91 (1956)	< 6 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 14]
***Giordenello v U S ***357 US 480 (1958)	< 5 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 15]
***United States v Interbartolo ***192 F Supp 537 (1961)	< 5 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 16]
***United States v Rivera ***321 F 2d 704 (1963)	< 4 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 17]
***Fox v University of Michigan Board of Regents ***375 MICH 238 (1965)	< 2 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 18]
***Jehan v U S ***381 US 214 (1965)	< 6 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 19]
***State Hwy Comm v Gulf Oil Corp ***377 MICH 309 (1966)	< 5 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 20]
***Whitely v Harden of Wyoming State Penitentiary ***401 US 560 (1971)	< 6 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 21]
United States v Ressev *485 F 2d 60 (1973)	< 4 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 22]
***Berstein v Pugh ***420 US 103 (1975)	< 9 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 23]
***People v Johnson ***396 MICH 424 (1976)	< 15 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 24]
***Bardfield v Wood ***104 Mich App 279 (1981)	< 2 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 25]
***Kent Prosecutor v Kent Judges ***110 Mich App 404 (1981)	< 3 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 26]
***People v Eaton ***184 Mich App 649 (1991)	< 7 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 27]
***In re White ***188 Mich App 189 (1991)	< 11 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 28]

**MASTER TABLE OF CONTENTS
for
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS SENIOR PLEADING continued**

***County of Riverside v McLaughlin ***500 US 44 (1991)	< 9 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 29]
***Bowie v Arder ***441 MICH 23 (1992)	< 19 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 30]
***Patterson v Klienman ***447 MICH 429 (1994)	< 4 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 31]
***People v Goetz ***457 MICH 442 (1998)	< 24 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 32]
***Dempsey v Safeco Inc Co of America ***232 Mich App 433 (1996)	< 6 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 33]
***Maiden v Rozwood ***461 MICH 109 (1999)	< 20 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 34]
***People v Miquera ***244 Mich App 429 (2001)	< 17 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 35]
***Overton v Ohio ***534 US 982 (2001)	< 2 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 36]
***In re Amb ***248 Mich App 144 (2001)	< 27 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 37]
***Howard v Boumen ***251 Mich App 136 (2002)	< 6 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 38]
***United States v Cotton ***535 US 625 (2002)	< 4 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 39]
***Reed v Reed ***265 Mich App 131 (2005)	< 22 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 40]
***Reed v Yackel ***473 MICH 520 (2005)	< 21 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 41]
***Matter of Green ***313 S E 2d 193 (1984)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 42]
***Rodrigues v State ***441 So 2d 1129 (1983)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 43]
***Stillwell v Markham ***135 KAN 206 (1932)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 44]
***State v Chatmon ***671 P 2d 531 (1983)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 45]

MASTER TABLE OF CONTENTS
for
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS SENIOR PLEADING - continued

***Honomichi v State ***333 N.W.2d 797 (1983)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 46]
***Ex parte Carlson ***176 WIS 538 (1922)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 47]
***Ralph v Police of El Cerrito ***190 P 2d 632 (1948)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 48]
***People v Hardiman ***132 Mich App 382 (1984)	< 3 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 49]
***Holmes v Mason ***80 NEB 454 (1888)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 50]
***People v Katrina K ***185 Cal Rptr 869 (1982)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 51]
***State v Christiansen ***110 WIS 2d 538 (1938)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 52]
***State ex rel Henson v Rigg ***258 MINN 388 (1960)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 53]
***Kelly v Meyers ***263 Pac 903 (1928)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 54]
***MICH STATE CONST (1963) M C L A Const Preamble (1964)	< 42 pages > < 14 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 55] [EXHIBIT Case # 55 A]
***State v Patterson ***98 N.C. 680 (1887)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 56]
***Joiner v State ***233 GA 367 (1967)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 57]
***Ferril v Keel ***105 ARK 380 (1912)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 58]
***Preckel v Byrne ***62 N.D. 356 (1932)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 59]
***Commonwealth v Illinois Cent R Co ***160 Ky 745 (1974)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 60]
***Sjoberg v Security Savings & Loan Assn ***73 MINN 203 (1898)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 61]
***State v Burrow ***119 TENN 376 (1907)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 62]

**MASTER TABLE OF CONTENTS
for
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS SENIOR PLEADING continued**

***Vaughn & Ragsdale Co v State Bd of Ed ***96 P 2d 420 (1939)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 63]
***Morgan v Murray ***328 P 2d 644 (1958)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 64]
***People v Dettenthaler ***118 MICH 595 (1898)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 65]
***Swann v Buck ***40 MISS 270 (1878)	< 1 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 66]
***State of Nevada v Rogers ***10 NEV 120 (1875)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 67]
***Cain v Robbins ***61 NEV 416 (1942)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 68]
***Kefauver v Spurling ***29 S W 14 (1926)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 69]
***Leininger v Alger ***316 MICH 644 (1947)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 70]
***State v Burlington & M R R Co ***60 NEB 741 (1900)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 71]
***Bull v King ***286 N W 311 (1939)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 72]
***State v Beckman ***185 S W 2d 810 (1945)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 73]
***People v Monroe ***349 ILL 270 (1957)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 74]
***State v Yardley ***96 TENN 546 (1895)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 75]
***Megins v City of Duluth ***97 MINN 23 (1906)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 76]
***Hyman v State ***87 TENN 109 (1888)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 77]
***Wimberly v Georgia ***5 Ga App 263 (1908)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 78]
***State v Clinton County ***166 IND 162 (1906)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 79]

**MASTER TABLE OF CONTENTS
for
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS SENIOR PLEADING continued**

***Glasser v Rothchild ***221 MO 180 (1909)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 80]
***Brown v Cower ***225 Ga 165 (1969)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 81]
***Posados v Warner ***279 US 340 (1928)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 82]
***Internat Shoe v Shartel ***279 US 429 (1928)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 83]
***Ex parte Crane ***27 IDAHO 671 (1915)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 84]
***State v McEnroe ***283 N W 57 (1938)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 85]
***State v Rigg ***260 MINN 141 (1961)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 86]
***Leroy v Special Ind Sch Dist ***172 N W 2d 764 (1969)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 87]
***State v Helmer ***169 MINN 221 (1926)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 88]
***Coffin v Ogdon ***85 US 120 (1873)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 89]
***Newell v People ***7 NY 9 (1873)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 90]
***State ex rel v Sutton ***63 MINN 147 (1895)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 91]
***State v Holm ***62 N W 2d 52 (1954)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 92]
***Butler Taconite v Roemer ***282 N W 2d 867 (1979)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 93]
***Baskin v State ***107 OK 272 (1925)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 94]
***United States v Siviglia ***686 F 2d 832 (1981)	< 5 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 95]
***State ex rel Danielson v Village of Mound ***234 MINN 531 (1951)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 96]

**MASTER TABLE OF CONTENTS
for
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS SENIOR PLEADING - continued**

***State v Mandehr ***209 N W 750 (1926)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 97]
***Hooker v Roles ***346 F 2d 285 (1965)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 98]
***Cohens v Virginia ***6 Wheat (19 US) 264 (1821)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 99]
***Merritt v Welsh ***104 US 694 (1881)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 100]
***Cotting v Kansas City Stockyards ***183 US 19 (1901)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 101]
***Sweet v Gibson ***123 MICH 699 (1900)	< 2 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 102]
***Steel Co v Citizens for a Better Environment ***523 US 83 (1998)	< 16 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 103]
***Mudge v Maples ***59 MICH 307 (1884)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 104]
***Weaver v Lemmon ***62 MICH 366 (1888)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 105]
***Atty Gen v Rice ***64 MICH 385 (1888)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 106]
***Artuz v Bennett ***531 US 4 (2000)	< 3 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 107]
***Holmes v Cole ***95 MICH 272 (1895)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 108]
***Stevenson v Bay City ***26 MICH 44 (1864)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 109]
***Toliver v Brownell ***94 MICH 577 (1895)	< 1 page >	[EXHIBIT Case # 110]
***Citizens Concerned for Separation of Church and State v The City and County of Denver ***628 F 2d 1289 (1980)	< 7 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 111]
***Basso v Utah Power and Light Company ***495 F 2d 906 (1974)	< 3 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 112]
***United States v Addonizio ***442 US 178 (1979)	< 5 pages >	[EXHIBIT Case # 113]

MASTER TABLE OF CONTENTS
for
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS SENIOR PLEADING - continued

***U S CONSTITUTION (1791) < 19 pages > [EXHIBIT Case # 114]

Caption Page Number (1038) =
United States of America v State of Arizona // Case CV 10-1413 PHX SRB
(Filed July 6 2010) Decided July 28 2010

***Arizona appealed to the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals. The previous order and injunction was upheld in favor of the US. This decision was alsoAppealed to the Supreme Court of the United States SCOTUS

***This case has also been referred to as;

***President Barack Obama v The Governor and the State of Arizona

***In June of 2012 the U S Supreme Court denied Arizona in greatest part and upheld the US citizens right to be FREE FROM ARREST absent a valid WARRANT based on PROBABLE CAUSE and sworn to upon OATH OR AFFIRMATION of the COMPLAINANT while being decided by a NEUTRAL AND DETACHED MAGISTRATE WHO SHALL BY LAW BE ACTING AS THE INTERPOSER BETWEEN THE PRESUMPTIVELY INNOCENT CITIZEN/PERSON AND THE POLICE AND PROSECUTOR/S

This act by SCOTUS reaffirms the Court's continued and consistent opinion for over 200 years. Do we need to spend one more dime educating the Judiciary and the Prosecutors in toto in order to get it right?
When is ENOUGH ACTUALLY ENOUGH? < 36 pages > [EXHIBIT Case # 115]

[Item 44 = B741 > B788] plus;
1 Case Index page numbered (1075) which precedes page B741

[Item (44)] *** [APPENDIX I] =
LACK OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION CHRONOLOGY OF LEGISLATIVE INTENT 48 Pages

[Item (45)] *** Section C; Synopsis
Page 1124

[Item 46 = Pages C1 > C147]

[Item (46)] *** Section II continued =
THIRD MODEL MOTION for MARTY B MILLER // TABLE OF CONTENTS AND INDEX OF EXHIBIT ATTACHMENTS FOR; MARTY B MILLER Case #82-55278 FY // ATTACHED EXHIBITS // TABLE OF AUTHORITIES INDEX

[Item (47)] *** Section D; Synopsis
Page 1272

[Item 48 = Pages D1 > D112]

[Item (48)] *** Section II continued =
FOURTH MODEL MOTION for STEPHEN S LEITH // TABLE OF CONTENTS AND INDEX OF EXHIBIT ATTACHMENTS FOR; STEPHEN S LEITH Prison #239190 Case #93-1705 FC // ATTACHED EXHIBITS // TABLE OF AUTHORITIES INDEX

MASTER TABLE OF CONTENTS
for
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS SENIOR PLEADING continued

[Items 49 > 106 page amounts = 1 caption page plus EXHIBITS]

[Item (49)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT B] = DEAN RECTOR
31 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (50)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT C] = ANTHONY BONELLI
8 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (51)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT D] = ERIN F BUSH
3 Pages of EXHIBITS DD] = JOHN JOSEPH ORLANDO

5bq5 DD] = ERNEST GREEN
[Item (52)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E] = HUGO MORAN DOPICO SIC.
4 Pages of EXHIBITS DD] = SHANNON THOMAS

[Item (53)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E1] = JEFFREY T DENTON
10 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (54)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E2] = MICHAEL O RAJHALA
7 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (55)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E3] = GREGORY D SNYDER
9 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (56)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E4] = CHARLES HILAR
12 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (57)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E5] = XAVIER VERA
4 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (58)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E6] = LONNIE O STEEN
10 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (59)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E7] = FREDERICK N ATKINS
14 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (60)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E8] = THOMAS C PRYOR Jr
8 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (61)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E9] = HASSAN M RIZK
9 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (62)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E10] = TIMOTHY L RODRIGUEZ
4 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (63)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E11] = JOHNNY LEE BROWN
7 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (64)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E12] = BRIAN K OFFENBACHER
6 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (65)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E13] = CHARLES HARPER
10 Pages of EXHIBITS

MASTER TABLE OF CONTENTS
for
WRT OF HABEAS CORPUS SENIOR PLEADING continued

[Item (66)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT 7 Pages of EXHIBITS	E14] = DOUGLAS M ALBERTA
[Item (67)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT 8 Pages of EXHIBITS	E15] = MICHAEL D THOMPSON
[Item (68)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT 9 Pages of EXHIBITS	E16] = DENNIS E MOGILLIS
[Item (69)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT 13 Pages of EXHIBITS	E17] = MARK J SOULE
[Item (70)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT 5 Pages of EXHIBITS	E18] = RICKY L TROUTEN
[Item (71)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT 9 Pages of EXHIBITS	E19] = ROBERT A JONES
[Item (72)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT 46 Pages of EXHIBITS	E20] = BRIAN J MILLER II
[Item (73)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT 29 Pages of EXHIBITS	E21] = CHRISTOPHER C MCCRAY
[Item (74)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT 15 Pages of EXHIBITS	E22] = JOHN J ANDERSON
[Item (75)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT 13 Pages of EXHIBITS	E23] = MICHAEL C HOLLINGSWORTH
[Item (76)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT 13 Pages of EXHIBITS	E24] = CARLOS VARTENELLI
[Item (77)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT 20 Pages of EXHIBITS	E25] = CHESTER W MCCOMB
[Item (78)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT 4 Pages of EXHIBITS	E26] = JOHNATHON A HOWELL
[Item (79)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT 21 Pages of EXHIBITS	E27] = KUMAL J BURTON
[Item (80)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT 12 Pages of EXHIBITS	E28] = CLIFTON P MOFFAT
[Item (81)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT 18 Pages of EXHIBITS	E29] = MICHAEL L ALLRED
[Item (82)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT 5 Pages of EXHIBITS	E30] = TIMOTHY A NICHOLS

MASTER TABLE OF CONTENTS
for
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS SENIOR PLEADING - continued

[Item (83)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E31] = DAVID A CHERRY
6 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (84)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E32] = LUKEMAN A MADYUN
11 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (85)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E33] = KEITH W HENTSCHEL
11 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (86)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E34] = MARK A WOODBECK
5 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (87)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E35] = TIMOTHY J QUILLAN
11 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (88)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E36] = JIMMY N CLARK III
19 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (89)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E37] = JOHNNIE PATTERSON III
6 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (90)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E38] = JOHN L MURPHY
19 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (91)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E39] = LUTHER T JENKINS
7 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (92)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E40] = LONNIE L CORBEN
5 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (93)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E41] = JEREMY L WILKINSON
10 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (94)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E42] = BRIAN L FRAZIER
14 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (95)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E43] = JOHN P PHILLIPS
3 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (96)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E44] = THOMAS M VIRDEN
3 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (97)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E45] = TRACY C HAMMOND
3 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (98)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E46] = CHARLES HAWKINS
4 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (99)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT E47] = ROBIN RICK MANNING
3 Pages of EXHIBITS

MASTER TABLE OF CONTENTS
for
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS SENIOR PLEADING continued

[Item (100)] *** [CUMULATIVE EXHIBIT F] = "VICTIMS LIST"
40 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (101)] *** [EXHIBIT K/O Letter]
2 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (102)] *** [EXHIBIT K/O Letter #2]
4 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (103)] *** [EXHIBIT K/O Letter #3]
3 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (104)] *** [EXHIBIT K/O Letter #4]
3 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (105)] *** [EXHIBIT K/O Letter #5]
2 Pages of EXHIBITS

[Item (106)] *** [VERIFICATION & PROOF OF SERVICE]
1 Page

TABLE OF AUTHORITY
for WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

MEAD v PARKER
464 F.2d 1108 (1972)

HENSLEY v MUNICIPAL COURT, SAN JOSE MILPITAS J.D., CAL.
93 S.Ct. 1571 (1973)

UNITED STATES EX REL. SERO v PREISER
506 F.2d 1115 (1974)

RODRIGUEZ v HAYES
591 F.3d 1105 (9th Cir. 2010)

UNITED STATES CODE

TITLE

28 USC § 1343(a)(3)
28 USC § 2241 et seq
28 USC § 2242 et seq
28 USC § 2243 et seq
28 USC § 2244 et seq
28 USC § 2245 et seq
28 USC § 2254 (B)(i), (ii) exclusively

42 USC § 1983 (110 Stat 3853)
42 USC § 1985 (17 Stat. 13) (1), (2) and (3)
42 USC § 1986 (17 Stat. 15)

FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE;

Rule 3 COMMENCING AN ACTION

FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE; Rule 23 et seq. CLASS ACTION

Rule 23(a)(1), (2), (3), (4);

Rule 23(b)(1)(A)(3)(D);

Rule 23(c)(A), (B), (C);

Rule 23(c)(2)(A), (B)(i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vi), (vii);

Rule 23(d)(1)(A), (B)(i), (ii), (iii);

Rule 23(d)(1)(C), (D), (E);

FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE;

Rule 3 THE COMPLAINT

Rule 4 ARREST WARRANT OR SUMMONS ON A COMPLAINT

Rule 5 INITIAL APPEARANCE